

Bloch, Allen
[American School of Classical
Studies at Athens, Greece]

*Also contains a letter from E.S.G. Robinson,
at the Department of Coins and medals,
British Museum, to "Mr. West," discussed in
Bloch's letter.

American School
of Classical Studies
Athens, Greece.

June 21, 1929

Dear Noe:

After long wanderings I have at last arrived in Athens, and my first letter must be to you. Doubtless you have received casts from London and Cambridge, and you may have guessed that I had visited the British Museum and the McClean collection. In the latter place I saw the coins, but no responsible person. In the British Museum I met Hill and Robinson. Unfortunately the latter had to leave for some days to attend a Museum Directors meeting, and I did not have much chance to talk with him.

Since my visits, I have had scarcely a moment in which to gather my thoughts together, and even now I am working under pressure to get this letter off. Still I am at my old table in the School Library, and feeling very much at home, I can think over the various problems in an atmosphere congenial to scholarship.

Thasos

Galley 8

- ✓ No. 1, c McClean 4209 has a dolphin symbol. It should be changed to No. 9c
✓ 11d McClean 4212 has a cornucopia. It should be No. 2 1.

- ✓ No. 2. Add m. Brit. Museum 3.85
6 d. Here is a mystery, I cannot solve. The coin we have illustrated is not BM ~~34~~ 43. I am writing to Robinson to see whether it came from the BM, and to ask what the symbol of No. 43 is like.

Galley 9

- ✓ No. 28. Add γ. Br. Mus. 1.49
I asked to have a cast of this piece sent to you in the hope that we might use it for a cut. We have no illustration of this type.

Galley 10.

- ✓ Br. Mus. 40. Mr. Hill and I were inclined to think this piece spurious. I am now sorry that we gave it a number. I think the piece might be left in with a note to the effect that it is suspected. I have written to Robinson to learn his opinion. If he agrees with Hill, we need not hesitate to call it false.

Galley 13

- ✓ No. 1 b. I think I asked for a cast of this also. It is not like No. 1. A. I think both dies are new, the vine resembling No. 14 (Metrodotos) and the obverse resembling No. 12. Its die nos. would then be 7 a-12a.

Galley 14.

- No. 13. There can be no doubt, I think, that the Pozzi piece (1043) is Bachelor 1907, 41, and that the Bachelor piece is not McClean 3953 ex Sotheby 1900, 234.
Nos. 23-26; The description is incorrect in so far as it

concerns the spelling. The third spelling should be MAPANEITEQN

No. 44 b. I saw a cast of the Mionnet piece listed here. It is from the same dies, and I think it should be listed as specimen c-

Suspicious Metrophon group.

I asked the Mc Clean people to send you a cast of McClean 3956. You probably remember our discussion of the possibility that it might not be from the same dies as the other pieces. The numismatic library in the museum at Cambridge was so limited that I was unable to compare the cast with the other published specimens, and I have nothing to add except that I gained the impression that it was from ~~similar dies~~ ~~identical dies~~ ~~with the Berlin dies~~ similar to, but not identical with the Berlin piece we were planning to use as a cut.

Galley 26

No. 67 The forgery in the British Museum, Num. Chron 1888, p. 3 is ~~apparently~~ almost certainly not by the hand of Christodoulos, although Christodoulos seems to have been copying ~~this~~ a piece from the same dies. A forgery of a forgery is rather amusing. I wonder whether the Hermitage piece may not be like the BM piece in antedating Christodoulos. As I remember my conversation with Hill, he was quite positive that the BM piece was not the product of the Christodoulos mint.

No. 68 The Mionnet piece, of which I saw a cast, is from same dies as Gotha. It should be given the letter b, Gotha being a.

Galley 31. No. 83. BM 28 is from same dies as No. 81, Berlin. It ought to be listed with it as specimen b of dies 1-4. Have you ever checked up on the Newell piece weighing 11.13 (Possiddios) If it belongs here and has a different die combination, it might take the place of the omitted BM piece.

No. 95. BM 25 should be listed as d of 92, dies 9-12.

No. 84. Mionnet, I, 389, 166, should be added as specimen d dies 4-6.

Galley 32.

No. 101. ~~zzz~~ This has a new reverse, but it seems to be from same obverse as 98. I can't be quite sure. Better give it the die numbers 11a-15a.

No. 103 Not like No. 104 in either die. Die no. 14a-17a

No. 104. BMC 23 has two new dies. It should be listed as 104 a, with dies 14b-17b.

No. 121 Make BM 27 specimen b of 120, dies 22-26. Then ~~xxxxxxx~~ list Mionnet, I, 389, 169, with die nos. 21-27 a, as No. 121 under the magistrate Polyaretou.

No. 126. We have listed this as Seltman. The piece is in the BM. It weighs 11.01 and is identical with the one to which we have given the number 129.

132 Mionnet has same obv. as 131. Probably different Rev. die. Give it die nos. 26-32a.

136 BM has a piece weighing 10.15, which is considered spurious. It is so close to the Vienna piece that I was unable to say that the dies were different. It is rather startling to find ~~that~~ so many of the exceptionally light pieces ~~xxxx~~ of this type, and the BM specimen makes a fourth.

No. 141 This is from same dies as 140, 33-40.

~~Galleyxxx.~~

Galley 24. In the description of the smaller pieces, BM 44 must be changed. The easiest way to do it is to transfer the two lines of this item to a position immediately following the two Empedocles coins, for there is no inscription on the Rev. Or we can say, Reverse as above, but without inscription. The first alternative is probably preferable.

This is the sum and substance of the information gained in London and Cambridge. It is very disconcerting, and I shall leave it to you to use as you see fit. The casts I hope can be used for cuts in the text as I have suggested. Actual errors must be corrected, preferably in the text. Addenda can be used for additions, if that seems preferable. The new information certainly plays havoc with our system of serial numbers, for it requires the omission of certain numbers when amalgamations of two items results, unless we relegate the new material to an appendix.

My regards to Mrs. Noe and the twins etc.

Athens is not as hot as it might be. We came in a terrible wind and dust storm, ameliorated somewhat by the sea water used to lay the dust and to make mud puddles in the streets. The Blegens are gone, Blegen just recovered from a light case of typhoid. Dining with Mr. Hill tonight.

We go to Corinth very soon, probably before I have a chance to see coins in Athens. Have just located another lost fragment of the tribute lists, which gives us one little bit of additional information despite its having only four numbers on it.

Yours hastily and sincerely,

Allen B. Smith

DEPARTMENT OF COINS AND MEDALS,
BRITISH MUSEUM,



LONDON, W.C.1.

28:VII:29

Dear Mr West

In reply to your letter
of the 22nd —

The coin entered A on
the enclosed photograph
is not the BMC 43. Though
the latter has the
same symbol (astylol) as
A rather than B.

It is not from the same die

but from a very similar
one.

The Cockrell coin has
the conspicuous symbol.

as regards RMC No 40.

I have talked over this
coin with Mr. Felt. He
still regards it as
doubtful, though not
certainly false.

Personally, for what
my opinion is worth,

I should not be inclined
to go so far. I agree there
are certain curious features
about the coin. 1) flatness
of the reverse. 2) badly
cut letters 3) unbarred A.

On the other hand, the weight
is correct & the coin has
been in R.M. over a
century: it is not unusual
for a 18th cent. finger to
get the weight right.

4) The Bunkley specimen
with the same monogram HT,
(and others for all I know)

though few different des-
cribes the same poor lettering
a summary review style.

I was so sorry to
miss little of you when
you were here &
hope to have better
luck next time

Yours warmly
E. H. Robinson